

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action<sup>1</sup>, the Examiner objected to claims 1, 5, and 7; rejected claims 1, 3, 4, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,724,403 to Santoro et al. ("*Santoro*"), in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0078447 to Mizutome et al. ("*Mizutome*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2005/0165848 to Kusama et al. ("*Kusama*"); rejected claims 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Santoro* and *Kusama*; and rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Santoro*, *Kusama*, and further in view of WO 01/39494 to Escobar et al. ("*Escobar*").

Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, and 7, and claims 1-9 remain pending.

Regarding the objection to claims 1, 5, and 7, Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, and 7 as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). *Santoro*, *Mizutome*, and *Kusama* do not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 3, 4, and 9. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has, therefore, not been established.

Claim 1 recites an electronic equipment comprising, for example:

script text acquisition means for acquiring a plurality of script texts, containing at least a media element identification of the visual media information to be input from one of the interfaces, an external source information of the media element, a display layout of the media element

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

on the display screen, and an indication of a type of equipment connected to at least one of the plurality of interfaces;

wherein the script text acquisition means determines whether the selected script text is an Extensible Markup Language (XML) text or a Synchronized Multimedia Integration Language (SMIL) text, performs an error process if the selected script text is not an XML text or an SMIL text, and cuts and divides the selected script text into a part defining the layout of the display and a part defining the display of the visual media information if the selected script text is an SMIL text.

(emphasis added). *Santoro*, *Mizutome*, and *Kusama*, even if combined as suggested by the Examiner, fail to teach or suggest at least the claimed “script text acquisition means.”

*Santoro* discloses a graphical environment including a grid of tiles (col. 4, lines 34-54). As depicted in Fig. 7 of *Santoro*, grid 700 comprises a matrix of tiles 702, 704, 706, 708, and 710 that are associated with different content, and grid 700 “controls the layout and priorities of the tiles” (col. 10, lines 53-54). The data structure of the tiles includes tile address 502 “that defines the location of the file system where the tile image is stored” and target address 504 “that is the location at which the file or application program associated with the tile can be found” (col. 9, lines 62-65).

The Examiner appears to assert that the grid configuration in *Santoro* discloses the claimed “script text acquisition means” (Office Action at pages 3-5). Applicant continues to disagree with the Examiner’s position for at least the reasons stated in the Response filed October 24, 2008.

The Examiner correctly states, “*Santoro* and *Mizutome* do not teach wherein the wherein the script text acquisition means determines whether the selected script text is

an XML text or an SMIL text, performs an error process if the selected script text is not an XML text or an SMIL text” (Office Action at page 5).

*Kusama* does not cure the deficiencies of *Santoro* and *Mizutome*. *Kusama* discloses allowing “registration of meta-data in binary data” (paragraph 0020). The Examiner states that paragraphs 0067, 0093, and 0123 of *Kusama* disclose the claimed “wherein the script text acquisition means determines whether the selected script text is an Extensible Markup Language (XML) text or a Synchronized Multimedia Integration Language (SMIL) text, performs an error process if the selected script text is not an XML text or an SMIL text, and cuts and divides the selected script text into a part defining the layout of the display and a part defining the display of the visual media information if the selected script text is an SMIL text” (Office Action at page 5). This is not correct.

According to these passages of *Kusama*, if it is determined “that the XML file is not XML data in the correct format . . . an XML data error is displayed” (paragraph 0067). In *Kusama*, the method merely determines if an XML file is XML data in the correct format, and the method may display an error if the XML file is not XML data in the correct format. However, determining if an XML file is XML data in the correct format does not teach or suggest determining “whether the selected script text is an Extensible Markup Language (XML) text or a Synchronized Multimedia Integration Language (SMIL) text.”

*Kusama* merely determines if data already in a file that is known to be an XML file is in the correct format. *Kusama* does not determine the type of language of a script text. In contrast, *Kusama* already knows the file is an XML file. Moreover, *Kusama* is

silent regarding an SMIL text. Therefore, *Kusama* cannot determine if a “script text” is an XML text or an SMIL text.

In addition, the “error process” in claim 1 is performed “if the selected script text is not an XML text or an SMIL text.” In contrast, the error in *Kusama* is displayed if the “XML file is not XML data in the correct format” (paragraph 0067). Displaying an error if XML data is not in the correct format does not teach or suggest performing “an error process if the selected script text is not an XML text or an SMIL text,” as further recited in claim 1.

Therefore, *Kusama* does not teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements including, for example, a “script text acquisition means” that 1) “determines whether the selected script text is an Extensible Markup Language (XML) text or a Synchronized Multimedia Integration Language (SMIL) text,” 2) “performs an error process if the selected script text is not an XML text or an SMIL text,” and 3) “cuts and divides the selected script text into a part defining the layout of the display and a part defining the display of the visual media information if the selected script text is an SMIL text,” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, *Santoro*, *Mizutome*, and *Kusama* fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1. Claims 3, 4, and 9 are also allowable at least due to their depending from claim 1.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Santoro* and *Kusama*.

As previously stated, neither *Santoro* nor *Kusama* teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements including, for example, a “script text acquisition means” that 1)

“determines whether the selected script text is an Extensible Markup Language (XML) text or a Synchronized Multimedia Integration Language (SMIL) text,” 2) “performs an error process if the selected script text is not an XML text or an SMIL text,” and 3) “cuts and divides the selected script text into a part defining the layout of the display and a part defining the display of the visual media information if the selected script text is an SMIL text,” as recited in claim 5.

Accordingly, *Santoro* and *Kusama* fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 5. Claim 6 is also allowable at least due to its depending from claim 5. Independent claim 7 and dependent claim 8, while of different scope, are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above in regard to claim 5.

Regarding the rejection of claim 2, dependent from claim 1, the Examiner relies on *Escobar* for allegedly disclosing “virtual channels” (Office Action at pages 8-9). Even assuming this allegation is correct, which Applicant does not concede, *Escobar* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Santoro*, *Mizutome*, and *Kusama* discussed above. Therefore, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established, and claim 2 is also allowable over *Santoro*, *Mizutome*, *Kusama*, and *Escobar* for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and withdrawal of the rejections. Pending claims 1-9 are in condition for allowance, and Applicant requests a favorable action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 31, 2009

By: /David W. Hill/  
David W. Hill  
Reg. No. 28,220